

1 A No.

2 Q Not only there wasn't a discussions, what you are
3 telling us is public record. If a business competitor
4 wanted to do the research, they could find that information
5 out, couldn't they?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And if they wanted to hold up a business
8 competitor, they could then file a petition with the FCC to
9 cause government scrutiny and perhaps slow down their
10 competitor's attempts to expand their T-band business; isn't
11 that correct?

12 A It would seem so.

13 Q When the applications were submitted in June of
14 1996, you can either look at Exhibit 66, that's fine, those
15 were the addresses provided to PCIA; is that correct?

16 A That is correct.

17 Q Okay. And you previously testified that your
18 recollection PCIA would have -- it would have been their
19 practice to mail whatever documents they needed to mail to
20 these applicants at these addresses?

21 A That's their customary routine.

22 Q Okay. And that was your state of mind at the time
23 you submitted these applications?

24 A Yes, it was.

25 Q Did Mr. Ronald Brasher ever bring up the topic of

1 how to cause the mailings to go to anyplace else other than
2 these very addresses?

3 A No.

4 Q In addition to the PCIA mailings, were you aware
5 at that time that the FCC also would have sent
6 correspondence to these applicants?

7 A They would have sent them the final license.

8 Q And if there was any, let's say a Form 800
9 construction letter or construct letter, would that have
10 gone there?

11 A Yes, it would have.

12 Q In fact, any dealings or any correspondence the
13 FCC would have needed to send to these licensees or
14 applicants would have gone to this address?

15 A That is correct.

16 Q Okay. And those addresses and those applicants
17 and ultimately the licensees, you testified that information
18 would have been available from the public record, is that
19 correct, or -- I'm sorry. Let me back up and ask you that.

20 Could someone have, and I won't say someone, a
21 vendor have come by one of these names with this address to
22 send them information regarding a particular vendor service
23 relating to the radio business?

24 A Yes. That information -- typically, once an
25 application goes to the Commission, it's generally,

1 depending on the FCC's backlog, it may take 10 days or two
2 weeks or less before it's entered into their databases. And
3 from that point it's available from FCC databases or through
4 other companies that offer these database services. There
5 is a couple of them.

6 There is one of them in particular that I use that
7 gets a fresh download from the FCC every night, and up until
8 very recently I have used that in preference to the FCC
9 database because it's been a little bit more user friendly,
10 and it gave the data in a format that I liked a little bit
11 better.

12 But yes, the answer is it would be available once
13 it's keyed into the FCC databases from several sources.

14 Q Okay. Again, if there was information where a
15 vendor in the communications industry wanted to communicate
16 with an applicant, they would have access to that from
17 publicly available sources at that address?

18 A Yes, that's correct.

19 Q On Exhibit 66, page 3, I believe, I just want to
20 make sure I understood that your testimony was Ron Brasher
21 requested 10 different frequencies as a result of his
22 research and with discussions with you; is that correct?

23 A That's correct. That was -- as best as my memory
24 serves me, that frequency research was probably a combined
25 effort on his part and my part.

1 Q Okay. The 10 names used for the application, is
2 that on the right-hand side of page 3? Do you see that?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Is it your understanding there was not a
5 particular significance which name went with any particular
6 frequency?

7 A Not to my knowledge.

8 JUDGE STEINBERG: I don't remember it that way. I
9 remember it that -- oh, particular significance?

10 MR. PEDIGO: Right.

11 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.

12 BY MR. PEDIGO:

13 Q I mean, for example, Metroplex, the second name,
14 could have been switched out with Jennifer Hill; is that
15 correct?

16 A I suppose. He just told me to do them that way.

17 JUDGE STEINBERG: He told you to associate
18 484.2875 with DLB?

19 THE WITNESS: That's correct, Your Honor.

20 JUDGE STEINBERG: And the rest with those
21 specifically --

22 THE WITNESS: Specifically.

23 JUDGE STEINBERG: -- by name?

24 THE WITNESS: Yes, and if there was any specific
25 reason for that, I'm not aware of it.

1 BY MR. PEDIGO:

2 Q And not only on behalf of Ron Brasher, you're not
3 aware of any significance in the application process that
4 would cause you to want to put Metroplex with that
5 particular frequency --

6 A No.

7 Q -- rather than Jennifer Hill?

8 A No.

9 Q Okay. You answered some questions about Ron
10 Brasher describing a need to expand Metroplex's business
11 into Allen, Texas area. Do you recall that?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Okay. So I just wanted to be clear, there was
14 never a discussion with him where he said he wanted to
15 obtain licenses merely to resell them to other radio
16 businesses, is that --

17 A No.

18 Q Okay. And are you familiar with the term
19 "spectrum warehousing"?

20 A Yes, I am.

21 Q And how do you understand that term?

22 A I have to be very careful about this because there
23 are certainly guilty people in that respect.

24 My understanding is companies that apply for
25 licenses with the sole intent of reselling those licenses at

1 a substantial profit, and they have no intent of ever
2 constructing those license or offering a service to the
3 public. And I might add that that process has messed up the
4 integrity of the entire licensing process.

5 Q But that kind of, or that particular type of abuse
6 was not at all related to these licenses?

7 A I was never aware of any of that type of abuse.

8 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Objection; relevance, Your
9 Honor. It's not relevant to any of the issues in this case,
10 I don't think, this last question.

11 MR. PEDIGO: Your Honor, if they want to stipulate
12 that there was no abuse of process, we will be glad to.

13 JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, I'll overrule the
14 objection. The answer was given before the objection was
15 made.

16 BY MR. PEDIGO:

17 Q At the time these applications were prepared or
18 approximately -- let me back up a minute.

19 How long would it take to prepare an application?

20 A Depending on my backlog, normally I get
21 applications put together within two to three days.

22 Q Okay.

23 A But that doesn't mean it took two to three days to
24 do it.

25 Q And in this case the applications had a lot of

1 similarities to them; is that correct?

2 A Yes.

3 Q I mean, in terms of lat/long?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Control point?

6 A Yes.

7 Q So is it fair to say that you were able to create
8 kind of a shell document and then modify it to some respects
9 for each of the 10 licensees?

10 A Probably so.

11 Q And you recall having done some of that work prior
12 to receiving this list of names on, I think you testified
13 June 12th?

14 A No.

15 Q Well, the research, for example, about the
16 frequencies you were going to use.

17 A Oh, yes. Yes.

18 Q Okay.

19 A Yes, we probably - these applications were
20 requested, as I remember, based on whatever frequency
21 research was done by Ron Brasher or me.

22 Q Okay. So this process had been ongoing for some
23 period of time prior to receiving these names; is that
24 correct?

25 A Probably so.

1 Q I mean, is it fair to say that receiving the names
2 is one of the last things you needed to do to complete each
3 application?

4 A As I recall, what I was told, and I think I said
5 this before, when Ron Brasher specified which licensees were
6 to be associated with which frequencies, at that point I
7 said I'm going to need their names and addresses, and that
8 fax, which is page 1 and 2, followed, and then I proceeded
9 to put the applications together.

10 Q Okay. All right. And if you could look at page 4
11 of that same exhibit please, Exhibit 66.

12 A All right.

13 Q You see the PCIA coordination numbers there
14 handwritten in; is that correct?

15 A Yes, I do.

16 Q Okay. Did you testify whose handwriting that was?
17 I don't recall.

18 A I didn't.

19 Q Okay. Do you know?

20 A It wasn't my handwriting and it was probably
21 either the handwriting of a girl that I had working for me
22 at the time or my wife, and I'm not really sure which.

23 Q If you look at let's say the Metroplex PCI control
24 number, do you understand that there is any logic in that
25 series of numbers?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And what do you understand the logic to be?

3 A The logic is that that application was entered
4 into the PCIA database in the year 1996.

5 Q Let me stop you there. How do you know that?

6 A Because I know what their -- I know what their
7 sequence is.

8 Q Right. Well, how do you know that from looking at
9 this series of numbers?

10 A The first two digits --

11 Q Thank you.

12 A -- indicate the year.

13 Q Okay.

14 A The next three digits indicate the day of the
15 year.

16 Q Is this commonly referred to as the Julian date?

17 A Yes, it is.

18 Q And this would have been the 176th day; is that
19 correct?

20 A Right.

21 Q So if we -- not checking this on a calendar, but
22 if we assume June 30th is the 180th day of the year, does
23 this tell us that some time in the last couple days of June
24 these would have been received?

25 A That's what it -- yes, whatever that works out to

1 be.

2 Q Okay.

3 A And the last digits are an internal PCIA that has
4 to do with factors like how many applications they have
5 processed that day and that sort of thing.

6 Q Okay.

7 A But the first digits indicate the year and the day
8 of the year.

9 Q Okay. So if we look at all of these PCIA control
10 numbers one through nine, we see that they were received in
11 that same batch and the same control numbers under those
12 last four digits; is that correct?

13 A Yes.

14 Q When these applications went in and you were aware
15 that they were all going to be operated by DLB
16 Enterprises/Metroplex Two Way Radio; is that correct?

17 A No.

18 Q Okay, when you saw the control point -- well,
19 where the control station was at 2244 Larson Lane, right?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Okay. And what did you understand that to be?

22 A That's the office of Metroplex Two Way Radio.

23 Q Okay. But how did you understand that in relation
24 to these applications?

25 A I really wasn't quite sure because for the most

1 part I didn't and still don't know who most of these people
2 are.

3 Q Right. Did you ask who they were?

4 A No.

5 Q I take it you don't need to know that to do the
6 application process?

7 A That's -- this goes into -- in my business I have
8 to deal in a manner that's similar to the way that the
9 Federal Communications Commission deals. When they receive
10 an application, although it's not wise for any of us, we all
11 make an assumption that if Bill Jones signed that
12 application, that it's really Bill Jones applying for a
13 license, and that signature of Bill Jones is an authentic,
14 valid signature.

15 If we don't make that assumption, then we indeed
16 do destroy the integrity of the whole process. So I don't
17 need to know who an applicant is.

18 Now, if Ron Brasher tells me that these people,
19 whoever they are, are eligible to hold a license, then I'm
20 going to submit the application because there is a
21 certification statement on the application where the
22 applicant testifies that he is eligible and he's not subject
23 to denial of benefits, et cetera, et cetera.

24 So here again that goes into -- that goes into a
25 legal counselor's process that I don't get involved in.

1 Q Right, and that's my question. That's not part of
2 the discussion you had with him?

3 A No.

4 Q And the reason that didn't come up is because
5 that's not your role?

6 A No, it is not my role.

7 Q Okay. And so whether a signature was authorized
8 to be put on there or not, that was just not any of your
9 concern at that time?

10 A No, it is not.

11 Q Are you aware of any requirement that -- well, let
12 me back up.

13 You did know that the Brasher family was
14 submitting several applications; is that correct?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Okay. And the other applications were in the name
17 of their company; is that correct?

18 A Yes.

19 Q Okay. And as far as you knew, that didn't cause
20 any problem that they were related parties there?

21 A Could you rephrase that? I'm not sure what you
22 are asking.

23 Q Well, the fact that these applications are all
24 going in at the same time and the family members are
25 involved or a d/b/a is used. That wasn't any concern for

1 you, was it?

2 A That's not a concern to me. And that gets more
3 into things like whatever the aggregation limits are for
4 certain portions of the spectrum, and that's not the role
5 that I play.

6 Q Okay. And you've worked with Ron Brasher for
7 years; is that correct?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And he would know then that that's not the kind of
10 opinion about the propriety or whether it's not proper to do
11 that, he would understand that's not the rule you were
12 trying to play?

13 A No.

14 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Object.

15 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, you have to be louder.

16 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay.

17 JUDGE STEINBERG: The objection is sustained
18 because this witness doesn't know what Ron Brasher would
19 know. He would know this, he would know that. You might
20 ask some foundation questions.

21 MR. PEDIGO: Okay. I think we have covered that,
22 Your Honor, in the past they had never talked about that.

23 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. You don't know what Ron
24 Brasher knows and what Ron Brasher doesn't know?

25 THE WITNESS: That's correct, Your Honor.

1 JUDGE STEINBERG: You have to be quicker.

2 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Just trying to wait for him
3 to finish before he got it, and --

4 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.

5 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: -- simultaneously with his
6 last words.

7 JUDGE STEINBERG: Either that, or let's go off the
8 record.

9 (Discussion off the record.)

10 MR. PEDIGO: Your Honor, let me confer with my co-
11 counsel.

12 (Pause.)

13 MR. PEDIGO: Your Honor, no further questions.

14 JUDGE STEINBERG: I have a couple before you
15 start. Do you know the name -- are you familiar with the
16 name of a company called Action Radio in probably the
17 Dallas/Fort Worth area?

18 THE WITNESS: No, Your Honor, I don't think so.

19 JUDGE STEINBERG: How about Pittencrieff,
20 P-I-T-T-E-N-C-R-I-E-F-F?

21 THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes.

22 JUDGE STEINBERG: How are you familiar with
23 Pittencrieff, and then after that, who are they or what are
24 they?

25 THE WITNESS: Pittencrieff, there was a company in

1 Hobbs , New Mexico called A&B Electronics. And A&B was a
2 fairly large radio dealer and one of their largest customers
3 was Pittencrieff, which is a -- Pittencrieff is a British
4 petroleum company, and Pittencrieff was one of the largest
5 customers of A&B, and subsequently bought out A&B and
6 entered the communications arena. And Pittencrieff became,
7 I guess, probably the second or third largest 800 SMR
8 operator in the country, and subsequently sold out to
9 Nextel.

10 JUDGE STEINBERG: And the Pittencrieff people are
11 nor probably in Tahiti or the Bahamas.

12 THE WITNESS: Right.

13 JUDGE STEINBERG: Or wherever.

14 THE WITNESS: Right.

15 JUDGE STEINBERG: Do you know if Pittencrieff
16 obtained licenses for the types of services we are talking
17 about today in multiple names?

18 THE WITNESS: No, I don't know that. I know that
19 Pittencrieff --

20 JUDGE STEINBERG: Did you understand the question?

21 THE WITNESS: Oh, yeah.

22 JUDGE STEINBERG: Basically, it would be a similar
23 situation where Mr. Brasher obtained or submitted
24 applications and obtained licenses in the names listed in
25 Exhibit 66. So he used multiple names to get licenses and

1 to tie them together in a system.

2 And what I want to know is you know whether
3 Pittencrieff did the same thing.

4 THE WITNESS: What I do know, Your Honor, is
5 Pittencrieff, to my knowledge, for the most part acquired
6 their licenses by buying up small radio dealers all over the
7 southwest and acquiring their licenses at the same time.

8 And the reason I know that is because when --
9 Pittencrieff only had an interest in 800 megahertz spectrum.
10 And yet in the process of buying up all of these little
11 dealers around the country a lot of them, or a lot of the
12 small dealers had been making a lot of VHF and UHF sales and
13 what have you, and it ended up that Pittencrieff was sending
14 me all applications for their customers who wanted licensing
15 below 800 megahertz, and I would assist their customers
16 because Pittencrieff just didn't want to mess with it. They
17 just wanted 800.

18 So to my knowledge, they acquired most of their
19 licenses buy buying up radio dealers that had license and
20 then they acquired other licenses in the Pittencrieff name
21 as far as I know. And this is -- they -- I don't know.
22 Maybe I shouldn't say this but they kind of got the attitude
23 that they -- they didn't need to do anything subversive
24 because they were like Nextel. They could get whatever they
25 wanted anyway.

1 JUDGE STEINBERG: How about did you ever hear
2 something called Madback Communications?

3 THE WITNESS: Yes, I know who Madback is.

4 JUDGE STEINBERG: Same question with respect to
5 them. Do you know whether they acquired licenses in
6 multiple names and tied them together into a system?

7 THE WITNESS: The only thing that I know about
8 Madback, I think that they were doing -- I think they were
9 doing some acquisition of license from other parties.

10 Now, I know that in the -- in the Dallas/Fort
11 Worth area, Madback had some 900 megahertz operations, and
12 those do still remain today. They have to be licensed as a
13 community repeater. So if they constructed a 900 megahertz
14 repeater, every person using that system would have to get
15 their own license.

16 JUDGE STEINBERG: That would be user's license?

17 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct. So they may,
18 they may have applied for licenses for various people, but
19 in reality maybe these various people were part of this one
20 community repeater or repeaters. So --

21 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, how about -- oh, I'm
22 sorry.

23 THE WITNESS: So I'm not aware of any -- go ahead.

24 JUDGE STEINBERG: Next would be Randy Angles,
25 A-N-G-L-E-S. Do you know anything about --

1 THE WITNESS: Well, what I hear is strictly
2 hearsay. I have never had any dealings personally with
3 Randy Angles, but I understand that he had had a lot of
4 dealings with the Federal Communications Commission.

5 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, let's -- I mean, we
6 wouldn't want hearsay in here.

7 (Laughter.)

8 JUDGE STEINBERG: Let the record reflect humor.
9 Champion Communications?

10 THE WITNESS: I know who they are.

11 JUDGE STEINBERG: Do you know whether they --

12 THE WITNESS: I know they were aggregating a lot
13 of UHF spectrum. If I'm not mistaken, they bought out all,
14 I think they bought all of Motorola's UHF community
15 repeaters nationwide. I believe that's correct.

16 JUDGE STEINBERG: Did you know if they were
17 applying for licenses using multiple names and tying them
18 into the same system?

19 THE WITNESS: No, I do not, Your Honor. That's
20 all I know about Champion.

21 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Let me go to Mr. Kellett.
22 And let me also say that Exhibit 13 is still outstanding,
23 and from my perusal of Exhibit 16, there may be some
24 connection --

25 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay, I apologize.

1 JUDGE STEINBERG: -- with this witness, and you
2 basically get it in now or forever hold your peace, or
3 whatever pages there were problems with.

4 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay.

5 JUDGE STEINBERG: And I don't at this point
6 remember the basis of the objection or if it went to the
7 whole document or just parts of it, probably just parts.

8 MR. ROMNEY: As I recall, it was an incredibly
9 good objection, Your Honor.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MS. LANCASTER: As I recall, it was frivolous,
12 Your Honor.

13 (Laughter.)

14 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

15 BY MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT:

16 Q First of all, could you look at Exhibit 13?

17 A Yes.

18 Q My first question is do you recognize this as
19 coming from your documents?

20 JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, let's -- you want the
21 whole thing or --

22 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: The whole thing.

23 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.

24 THE WITNESS: I think -- yeah, I furnished all of
25 this documentation. However, I was not directly related in

1 all of this paperwork.

2 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay.

3 BY MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT:

4 Q The application that appears, I think the NABER
5 form is on page 3 and the application that follows, I think
6 page 4 may not be the complete copy of that.

7 Do you recognize page 4?

8 A Yes.

9 Q Is that an old 574?

10 A Yes, it is.

11 Q And that's -- is that not a complete 574?

12 A Well, other than the part that doesn't show, yes.

13 The 574 typically was one page.

14 Q Okay. But there would have been a legal size
15 page, is that --

16 A Yes.

17 Q Okay. Is that your handwriting on there?

18 A Yes.

19 JUDGE STEINBERG: And this came from your files,
20 to the best of your knowledge?

21 THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor.

22 JUDGE STEINBERG: Page 3 also?

23 THE WITNESS: Yes. And that is my handwriting
24 also.

25 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Okay.

1 BY MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT:

2 Q And so you pulled these out of your business
3 records?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Okay. Is this an application that you prepared on
6 behalf of Ron Brasher?

7 A Yes.

8 JUDGE STEINBERG: What do you mean "this"?

9 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: The application beginning at
10 page 3.

11 JUDGE STEINBERG: And you are extending to where,
12 to the end?

13 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: I think all of it is related
14 documentation.

15 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.

16 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: To the end.

17 MR. ROMNEY: Excuse me. Could you repeat your
18 question?

19 BY MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT:

20 Q My question is, the documents beginning with page
21 3 of Exhibit 13 and extended to the end, is that an
22 application and related documents, and did you prepare the
23 application?

24 A Yes.

25 Q Okay. I would like to break down that question.

1 Is it all -- is it correct that it's an
2 application and related documents?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Okay. And now did you prepare the application?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Okay. Sometimes when we get on the record, when
7 you make a question, a compound question like that it's not
8 clear what you were asking.

9 (Pause.)

10 BY MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT:

11 Q Okay, and were all of the records kept in the
12 normal course of business in your files and you supplied
13 them to the FCC?

14 A Yes, that's correct.

15 Q Okay. Did you know at the time that you made this
16 assignment application that Ruth Bearden was dead?

17 A No.

18 Q I believe you testified --

19 JUDGE STEINBERG: Do you want to move it into
20 evidence?

21 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: Oh, yes, please. I would
22 like to move it into evidence, Your Honor .

23 MR. SCHWANINGER: We would like to voir dire just
24 a little bit, Your Honor.

25 JUDGE STEINBERG: Sure.

1 VOIR DIRE

2 BY MR. SCHWANINGER:

3 Q John, I would direct your attention to page 6 of
4 that exhibit. Do you recognize this document?

5 A Yes.

6 Q What is it?

7 A It's a money order to the FCC.

8 Q From whom?

9 A Well, I purchased it.

10 Q Okay. What's the sum on this?

11 A \$125.

12 Q Why would you have purchased a money order to be
13 made out to the FCC for \$125?

14 A It was an application fee.

15 Q Is it your testimony that the application fee with
16 an assignment application is \$125?

17 A No.

18 Q Then is it further your testimony that it is
19 possible that this particular money order doesn't go with
20 this assignment application?

21 A No, if I could clarify.

22 Q Please do.

23 A I'm not -- all right, all of this paperwork was
24 furnished by me. I did the work, and all except page 2,
25 which was an existing license prior to the time that I even

1 knew Ron Brasher. What I can't tell here because this 574
2 is incomplete, it appears that this was supposed to be an
3 assignment, but I'm not totally sure that it was actually
4 done as an assignment.

5 THE WITNESS: Now, Your Honor, if I could have
6 another 30 seconds, I may have this stuff in my briefcase.

7 JUDGE STEINBERG: Certainly.

8 (Pause.)

9 JUDGE STEINBERG: Go off the record.

10 (Pause off the record.)

11 JUDGE STEINBERG: Mr. Black?

12 THE WITNESS: All right, this application --

13 BY MR. SCHWANINGER:

14 Q When you are saying "this application," are you
15 referring to page 4 --

16 A I am referring to --

17 Q -- in the exhibit?

18 A I'm referring to -- yes, well, in its entirety,
19 Exhibit 13, but primarily starting with page 3 through the
20 end.

21 Q But we keep referring to an application, and I
22 can't find an application in here, John.

23 A The application is page 4, but you only have part
24 of it.

25 Q Okay. Then it's your testimony you think I've got

1 the top half of an application?

2 A I think you have the top half and I have a copy of
3 the original that I prepared.

4 JUDGE STEINBERG: I think we might need the bottom
5 half too.

6 MR. SCHWANINGER: Yeah.

7 MS. LANCASTER: Your Honor, would you like me to
8 go make copies of the entire document?

9 JUDGE STEINBERG: Well, if everyone needs them
10 right now, yes.

11 MR. ROMNEY: Could we just look at it?

12 JUDGE STEINBERG: Certainly, come on up and look.
13 Absolutely.

14 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: See what happened is --

15 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, let's go off the record.

16 (Discussion off the record.)

17 JUDGE STEINBERG: Back on the record.

18 At an appropriate time what we will do is
19 photocopy the entire application, top and bottom, and then
20 substitute the pages if you want to make it one -- if you
21 just want to photocopy the bottom half now and make it page
22 4(a), that would be fine.

23 MR. SCHWANINGER: Did you bring copies of the --
24 original copies of what remains here in Exhibit 13 or is
25 that the only additional page you have?

1 THE WITNESS: Well, you've got copies -- I think
2 you have copies of everything else.

3 MR. KNOWLES-KELLETT: He's asking if you have the
4 originals there. Do you have the originals of the money
5 orders and --

6 THE WITNESS: Well, yeah. Here's the -- here's
7 the copy of the money order.

8 MR. SCHWANINGER: I understand.

9 BY MR. SCHWANINGER:

10 Q What I am asking this question, did you keep these
11 all in one separate manilla folder? Is that how you keep
12 the records, and they would have all been filed by what,
13 call sign?

14 JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay, let the record reflect
15 that the answer to the manilla --

16 THE WITNESS: Yes.

17 JUDGE STEINBERG: -- folder question was yes. The
18 witness nodded his head yes.

19 THE WITNESS: Yes. Thank you.

20 They would have been -- they could -- it could
21 have been filed in several ways. Sometimes I file under
22 call sign, and sometimes I file a group of applications
23 together for -- if I have a customer that does quite a bit
24 of business with me, I may file all of his together.

25 MR. SCHWANINGER: All right.